

REMARKS

The Office Action of August 27, 2008 was received and carefully reviewed. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the currently pending rejections are requested for the reasons advanced in detail below. Claims 1-18 were pending prior to the instant amendment, with claims 1-7 and 14-18 having been withdrawn from consideration.

Filed concurrently herewith is a *Request for a Three Month Extension of Time* which extends the shortened statutory period of response to February 27, 2008. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the present response is being timely filed.

Claims 8-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosenfeld et al. (US 6,632,523). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

First, the Office Action alleges that Rosenfeld et al. teaches adhesive compositions that contain a polyimidesiloxane, an epoxy compound, and an isocyanate. Particularly, the Office Action cites col. 1, line 50 to col. 4, line 45, as well as columns 7 and 8, of Rosenfeld et al. to allege anticipation of Applicants' claimed invention. However, Applicants respectfully assert that Rosenfeld et al. merely discloses a cyanate and *not* an "isocyanate," as required by independent claim 8. As detailed at col. 1, lines 46-47 of Rosenfeld et al., "[t]he adhesive composition is prepared as a solution in an organic solvent of a polyimide, an epoxy resin, and *a cyanate*," (emphasis added).

In addition, Rosenfeld et al. continues, at col. 7, line 40 to col. 8, line 41, to detail various structures for the cyanate compound, and explicitly teaches that "Diisocyanates (i.e., compounds having two -NCO groups) have been found to give unsatisfactory properties." Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Rosenfeld et al. explicitly teaches cyanate compounds, and actually teaches away from isocyanate compounds. In direct contrast, Applicants' claimed invention requires, in part, a resin compound that includes "a polyvalent isocyanate compound." Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that the Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness since Rosenfeld et al. fails to teach or suggest the combination of features recited by independent claim 8.

Second, the Office Action acknowledges that Rosenfeld et al. "does not specifically teach an epoxy compound having the epoxy equivalent weight present in the amount as claimed." However, the Office Action merely dismisses Applicants' claimed specific weight

parts of epoxy compound having specific epoxy equivalents as being obvious. The Office Action cites various portions of Rosenfeld et al., and concludes that “it would have been within routine experimentation of the teachings of Rosenfeld et al. for one of ordinary skill in the art to include 20phr of the epoxy having an equivalent weight of 875 in the composition thereof.” Applicants respectfully disagree.

The Office Action alleges that Rosenfeld et al. teaches, at the top of column 10, an epoxy having an equivalent weight of 875. Specifically, Shell “1004F” is shown having a weight/epoxy amount of 875. However, Rosenfeld et al. clearly discloses, at the bottom of column 10, various exemplary adhesive compositions including an Example 2 that includes an epoxy compound having 25 weight parts of Shell “1004F” and 25 weight parts of Shell “836,” which has an equivalent weight of 314. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Rosenfeld et al. is completely silent with regard to a resin composition including, in part, “0.1 to 10 weight parts of an epoxy compound having an epoxy equivalent of 100 to 800.”

Moreover, although adjusting the amounts of epoxy may be within routine experimentation, which Applicants respectfully traverse, the fact remains that Rosenfeld et al. fails to teach or suggest: (1) an epoxy compound having an epoxy equivalent of 100 to 800 with the epoxy compound used in an amount of 01 to 10 weight parts per 100 weight parts of the resin having a polysiloxane skeleton and a polar group; or (2) an epoxy compound having an epoxy equivalent of more than 800 with the epoxy compound used in an amount of 01 to 20 weight parts per 100 weight parts of the resin having a polysiloxane skeleton and a polar group.

In addition, Applicants further note that Rosenfeld et al. teaches, col. 7, lines 64-66, that the various exemplary epoxy compounds shown at the bottom of column 10 are combined with a dicyanate, and not a isocyanate, as required by independent claim 8. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that Rosenfeld et al. further fails to teach or suggest the combination of features recited by independent claim 8.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully assert that the Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness since Rosenfeld et al. fails to teach or suggest at least “a polyvalent isocyanate compound,” as well as weight parts of an epoxy compound having epoxy equivalents in the relative amounts recited by independent claim 8.

Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn, that claims 8-13 be allowed, and that the application be passed to issue.

If a conference would expedite prosecution of the instant application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned to arrange such a conference.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON PEABODY LLP

/David B. Hardy, Reg.#47,362/
David B. Hardy

NIXON PEABODY LLP
Suite 900, 401 9th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004-2128
(202) 585-8000